

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 30, 2005, has been reviewed in detail and the application has been amended in the sincere effort to place the same in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance in its amended form are requested based on the following remarks.

Applicant retains the right to pursue broader claims under 35 U.S.C. §120.

Applicant has provided a unique solution with respect to problems regarding CUTTING INSERT AND USE THEREOF. Applicant's solution is claimed in a manner that satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,632,606 to Lagerberg in view of U.S. Patent 4,714,385 to Komanduri. In contrast to each of these references, amended Claim 1 recites: "said at least one cutting body being joined to said base body by an adhesive configured to withstand high temperatures generated during use of the cutting insert in recessing or copy turning metal workpieces." Also in

contrast, amended Claim 17 recites: "said at least one cutting body being joined to said base body by an adhesive configured to withstand high temperatures generated during use of the cutting insert in recessing or copy turning metal workpieces." Neither of the applied references teaches or suggests the above limitation.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 17, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, distinguish over and are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the applied prior art, either taken singly or in any reasonable combination thereof.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 19 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lagerberg in view of Komanduri and further in of U.S. Patent 6,217,263 to Wiman. In contrast to each of these references, amended Claim 19 recites: "said at least one cutting body being joined to said base body by an adhesive configured to withstand high temperatures generated during use of the cutting insert in recessing or copy turning metal workpieces." None of the applied references teaches or suggests the above limitation.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 19, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, distinguishes over and is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the applied prior art, either taken singly or in any reasonable combination thereof.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2-13, 21, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 2-9, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lagerberg in view of Komanduri, as applied against Claims 1 and 17, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,552,491 to Parker and European Publication No. 0552714. Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lagerberg in view of Komanduri, as applied against Claim 1, and further in view of Parker, European Publication No. 0552714, and U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0131832 to Morsch. Claims 9-12 have been canceled herein, without prejudice.

In contrast to each of these references, amended Claim 1 recites: "said at least one cutting body being joined to said base body by an adhesive configured to withstand high temperatures generated during use of the cutting insert in recessing or copy

turning metal workpieces." Also in contrast, amended Claim 17 recites: "said at least one cutting body being joined to said base body by an adhesive configured to withstand high temperatures generated during use of the cutting insert in recessing or copy turning metal workpieces." None of the applied references teaches or suggests the above limitation.

In that regard, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-8 and 13 also distinguish over and are not rendered obvious by the applied references based on their dependence from Claim 1. It is also submitted that Claims 21 and 22 distinguish over and are not rendered obvious by the applied references based on their dependence from Claim 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections is respectfully requested.

Art Made of Record:

The prior art made of record and not applied has been carefully reviewed, and it is submitted that it does not, either taken singly or in any reasonable combination with the other prior art of record, defeat the patentability of the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Further, Applicant is in agreement with the

Examiner that the prior art made of record and not applied does not appear to be material to the patentability of the claims currently pending in this application.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and early action towards that end is respectfully requested.

Petition for Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a):

Applicant hereby petitions for a two-month extension of time, from September 2, 2006 until November 2, 2006, in which to file the instant amendment in the above-cited case.

A payment in the amount of \$450.00, representing the two-month extension fee for a large entity, is submitted herewith.

Summary and Conclusion:

It is submitted that Applicant has provided a new and unique CUTTING INSERT AND USE THEREOF. It is submitted that the claims are fully distinguishable from the prior art. Therefore, it is requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued at an early date.

If mailed, I, the person signing this certification below, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an

Docket No.: NHL-KEH-26A
Serial No.: 10/789,927
Customer No.: 52671

envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated in the certification of mailing on the transmittal letter sent herewith, or if facsimile transmitted, I, the person signing this certification below, hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated in the certification of facsimile transmission on the transmittal letter which is being facsimile transmitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nils H. Ljungman/

Nils H. Ljungman, Esq.
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 25,997
Name of person signing certification
Nils H. Ljungman & Associates
P.O. Box 130
Greensburg, PA 15601-0130
Telephone: (724) 836-2305
Facsimile: (724) 836-2313